



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,765	10/22/2001	William O'Donnell	16319-05907	4715

758 7590 11/28/2005

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/029,765	Applicant(s) O'DONNELL ET AL.	
	Examiner Jeffrey D. Popham	Art Unit 2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Remarks

Claims 1-62 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Page 17 of the Remarks, filed 9/6/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 34, 37, 50, 51, and 54 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made with Sudia (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0013898) in view of Zhang (Zhang et al., "A Rule-Based Framework for Role-Based Delegation", 5/2001, pp. 153-162), Brickell2 (U.S. Patent 6,965,881), Control-F1 (Control-F1, "Control-F1 Launches CF1Live 'Branded, Hosted, Rented' eSupport Solution", 7/6/2000, pp. 1, obtained from http://web.archive.org/web/20001121025300/http://www.control-f1.com/news/pr_cf1livelaunch.html), and Onishi (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0149667).

2. Applicant's arguments with regard to claims 16, 52, 53, and 58, however, are not persuasive.

Applicant argues, with respect to claims 16 and 58, that Brickell1 (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0147917) does not disclose establishing a control relationship between the first user's authentication credential and a second user's authentication credential. Page 16, Paragraph 36 of Applicant's specification states

"Control relationships define any relevant relationships entities have with one another."

The control relationship within Brickell1 is the relationship in which the client, represented by his credential (certificate or client name), has control over which delegates, represented by their credentials (certificates or distinguished names), can access each specific client-controlled resource, how long they can access said resource, and the fact that the client can revoke this access to any or all resources or delegates at any time (Page 2, Paragraphs 18, 19, and 26-29).

Applicant argues, with respect to claims 52 and 53, that Brickell1 does not disclose an access level control module, nor transmitting input received by a client to an access level control module. The client in Brickell1 creates a key for a particular delegate to access a particular resource. Then the client splits the key, transmitting a portion to the delegate and the other portion to the access level control module (Page 2, Paragraphs 18 and 19). The access level control module is the portion of the server that regulates access to the resources stored thereon. The access level control module checks the table (reference 434 in figure 4) storing access controls for users of the system, and determines whether or not the delegate wishing to obtain access to a certain resource has an entry in the list specifying that he has the correct access permissions to do so (Page 2, Paragraph 22).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

Art Unit: 2137

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 16, 18-20, 23-29, 31-33, 52, 53, and 58-61 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brickell1 (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0147917) for the reasons cited in the office action dated 06/01/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickell1 in view of Control-F1 (Control-F1, "Control-F1 Launches CF1Live 'Branded, Hosted, Rented' eSupport Solution", 7/6/2000, pp. 1, obtained from http://web.archive.org/web/20001121025300/http://www.control-f1.com/news/pr_cf1livelaunch.html) for the reasons stated in the office action dated 06/01/2005.

5. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickell1 in view of Onishi (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0149667) for the reasons stated in the office action dated 06/01/2005.

6. Claims 30 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickell¹ in view of Chow (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0002678) for the reasons stated in the office action dated 06/01/2005.

7. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-14, 19, 20, 23, 24, 30, 54-57, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sudia (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0013898) in view of Zhang (Zhang et al., "A Rule-Based Framework for Role-Based Delegation", 5/2001, pp. 153-162).

Regarding Claim 1,

Sudia discloses a computer-implemented method for managing access to a signing authority, comprising:

Receiving, from a first user having an authentication credential with respect to the signing authority, a message that a second user be granted access to the signing authority (Page 15, Paragraph 249);

Receiving, from the second user, a request to access the signing authority (Page 15, Paragraph 250); and

Responsive to the request from the second user, obtaining the first user's authentication credential and granting the second user access to the signing authority by providing to the destination, the first user's authentication credential (signature), wherein the first user's authentication credential is not provided to the second user (Page 15, Paragraph 250).

Sudia does not disclose that the signing authority is used as an access mechanism for a resource to which the users wish to control access.

Zhang, however, discloses that the signing authority is used as an access mechanism for a resource to which the users wish to control access (Page 155, Section 3.2.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the role based delegation of Zhang into the certification system of Sudia in order to allow strict controls over what types of resources and access permissions each user has, using roles.

Regarding Claim 54,

Claim 54 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 2,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Sudia discloses that granting the second user access comprises activating a temporary access credential for the second user (Page 15, Paragraphs 249-250).

Regarding Claim 55,

Claim 55 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 3,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Sudia discloses that granting the second user access comprises creating an entity relationship between an account associated with the second user and an account associated with the first user (Page 15, Paragraphs 248-250). The account has been previously established when the smart card was issued to each the first and second users.

Regarding Claim 56,

Claim 56 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 5,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Zhang discloses that the message identifies the second user and specifies a level of access for the second user, and wherein granting the second user access comprises granting the specified level of access (Page 160, Section 4.4.1).

Regarding Claim 6,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Zhang discloses that the second user belongs to a group of users, and the message identifies the group of users to which the second user belongs (Page 157, Section 3.3). This group is the group to which the second user already belongs before delegation (prerequisite

condition). After delegation, the second user is a part of both the prerequisite group and the delegated group (possibly others, as well).

Regarding Claim 7,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 6, in addition, Zhang discloses receiving an identifier from the second user, identifying the second user as belonging to the group of users (Page 160, Section 4.4.1).

Regarding Claim 8,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 6, in addition, Zhang discloses authenticating the second user as belonging to the group of users (Page 160, Section 4.4.1).

Regarding Claim 10,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Sudia discloses authenticating the second user (Page 15, Paragraph 250); and wherein granting the second user access comprises: responsive to the request from the second user and responsive to the authentication of the second user being successful, granting the second user access by providing the first user's authentication credential (Page 15, Paragraph 250); and Zhang discloses that the access is to a resource (Page 155, Section 3.2.1).

Regarding Claim 57,

Claim 57 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 10 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 11,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Zhang discloses that granting the second user access to the resource comprises granting the second user a level of access different from a level of access available to the first user (Page 157, Section 3.3; and Page 160, Section 4.4.1).

Regarding Claim 12,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Sudia discloses that receiving the message comprises receiving the message via a network (Figure 25).

Regarding Claim 13,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 12, in addition, Sudia discloses that receiving the request comprises receiving the request via the network (Figure 25). This is the broader network of the entire system.

Regarding Claim 14,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Sudia discloses that receiving the request comprises receiving the request via a second network (Page 4, Paragraph 50).

Regarding Claim 19,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Sudia discloses terminating the second user's access after a predetermined time period (Pages 15-16, Paragraphs 249-251).

Regarding Claim 20,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 19, in addition, Sudia discloses that the predetermined time period is selectable by the first user (Page 15, Paragraph 249).

Regarding Claim 23,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Zhang discloses terminating the second user's access to the resource in response to a command received from the first user (Pages 157-159, Section 3.4).

Regarding Claim 24,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Zhang discloses terminating the second user's access to the resource in response to a predetermined event (Pages 157-159, Section 3.4).

Regarding Claim 30,

Sudia as modified by Zhang discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Sudia discloses that the access to the resource by the second user is masked so that the resource is unable to distinguish it from access by the first user (Page 15, Paragraph 247).

Regarding Claim 62,

Claim 62 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 30 and is rejected for the same reasons.

8. Claims 34-40 and 43-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sudia in view of Brickell2 (U.S. Patent 6,965,881).

Regarding Claim 34,

Sudia discloses a system for granting signing authority access to a second user in response to a message from a first user, comprising:

An authenticator communicatively adapted to receive over a network connection authentication credentials of the first and second users and adapted to authenticate each user from the authentication credentials (Page 15, Paragraph 248);

An interface for granting the second user access to the signing authority by providing the first user's credential to the authenticator for authentication, wherein the first user's authentication credential is not provided to the second user (Page 15, Paragraph 250);

But does not disclose an access level control module or that the signing authority is used as an access mechanism for a resource to which the users wish to control access.

Brickell2, however, discloses an authenticator communicatively adapted to receive over a network connection authentication credentials of

the first and second users and adapted to authenticate each user from the authentication credentials (Column 2, line 65 to Column 3, line 15);

An access level control module, communicatively coupled to the authenticator, for defining for each user a level of access to a resource for the user (Column 2, lines 29-34);

A resource interface, communicatively coupled to the access level control module, for granting the second user access to the resource (Column 2, line 65 to Column 3, line 6); and

That the signing authority is used as an access mechanism for a resource to which the users wish to control access (Column 2, lines 1-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the credential usage reporting of Brickell2 into the certification system of Sudia in order to provide a strict mechanism by which to control delegate access, as well as to provide detailed audit reports that can be used to verify unauthorized access.

Regarding Claim 35,

Sudia as modified by Brickell2 discloses the system of Claim 34, in addition, Brickell2 discloses that the access control module activates a temporary access credential for the second user (Column 2, lines 29-34).

Regarding Claim 36,

Sudia as modified by Brickell2 discloses the system of Claim 34, in addition, Brickell2 discloses that the access level control module creates



an entity relationship between an account associated with the second user and an account associated with the first user (Column 2, lines 1-34).

Regarding Claim 37,

Sudia discloses a system for granting signing authority access to a second user in response to a message from a first user, comprising:

An access control module, for establishing a control relationship between an authentication credential associated with the first user and an authentication credential associated with the second user (Page 15, Paragraph 249); and

An interface, coupled to the access control module, for granting the second user access to the signing authority, by providing to the destination, the first user's authentication credential, wherein the first user's authentication credential is not provided to the second user (Page 15, Paragraph 250);

But does not disclose that the access control module is an access level control module, in which the control relationship allows the first user to control at least one parameter of the second user's level of access or that the signing authority is used as an access mechanism for a resource to which the users wish to control access.

Brickell2, however, discloses that the access control module is an access level control module (Column 2, line 65 to Column 3, line 6), in

which the control relationship allows the first user to control at least one parameter of the second user's level of access (Column 2, lines 1-34);

A resource interface, communicatively coupled to the access level control module, for granting the second user access to the resource (Column 2, line 65 to Column 3, line 6); and

That the signing authority is used as an access mechanism for a resource to which the users wish to control access (Column 2, lines 1-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the credential usage reporting of Brickell2 into the certification system of Sudia in order to provide a strict mechanism by which to control delegate access, as well as to provide detailed audit reports that can be used to verify unauthorized access.

Regarding Claim 38,

Sudia as modified by Brickell2 discloses the systems of claims 34 and 37, in addition, Sudia discloses that the interface further terminates the second user's access to the resource (Page 15, Paragraphs 249-250).

Regarding Claim 39,

Sudia as modified by Brickell2 discloses the systems of claims 34 and 37, in addition, Sudia discloses that the interface further terminates the second user's access to the resource after a predetermined time period (Page 15, Paragraphs 249-250).

Regarding Claim 40,

Sudia as modified by Brickell2 discloses the system of claim 39, in addition, Sudia discloses that the predetermined time period is selectable by the first user (Page 15, Paragraphs 249-250).

Regarding Claim 43,

Sudia as modified by Brickell2 discloses the systems of claims 34 and 37, in addition, Brickell2 discloses that the resource interface further terminates the second user's access to the resource in response to a command received from the first user (Column 3, lines 7-15; and Column 4, lines 30-42).

Regarding Claim 44,

Sudia as modified by Brickell2 discloses the systems of claims 34 and 37, in addition, Brickell2 discloses that the resource interface further terminates the second user's access to the resource in response to a predetermined event (Column 3, lines 7-15; and Column 4, lines 30-42).

This predetermined event is the revocation of the certificate

Regarding Claim 45,

Sudia as modified by Brickell2 discloses the systems of claims 34 and 37, in addition, Brickell2 discloses an output device, coupled to the resource interface, for outputting, to the first user, notification of the second user's access to the resource (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 10).

Regarding Claim 46,

Sudia as modified by Brickell2 discloses the systems of claims 34 and 37, in addition, Brickell2 discloses a storage device, coupled to the resource interface, for storing information describing the second user's access to the resource (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 10).

Regarding Claim 47,

Sudia as modified by Brickell2 discloses the systems of claim 46, in addition, Brickell2 discloses that the storage device stores information identifying which user accesses the resource (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 10).

Regarding Claim 48,

Sudia as modified by Brickell2 discloses the systems of claims 34 and 37, in addition, Sudia discloses that the access to the resource by the second user is masked so that the resource is unable to distinguish it from access by the first user (Page 15, Paragraph 247).

Regarding Claim 49,

Sudia as modified by Brickell2 discloses the systems of claims 34 and 37, in addition, Brickell2 discloses that the resource comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a data file, a data file stored at a server, an application, and data associated with the first user (Figure 3).

Regarding Claim 50,

Sudia discloses in a client/server system for granting signing authority to a second user in response to a message from a first user specifying that the second user be granted the signing authority, a server comprising:

An authenticator, for authenticating each user according to authentication credentials (Page 15, Paragraph 250);

An access control module coupled to the authenticator (Page 15, Paragraphs 249-250); and

An interface, coupled to the access control module, for granting to a client operated by the second user access to the signing authority by providing the first user's authentication credential, wherein the first user's authentication credential is not provided to the second user (Page 15, Paragraph 250);

But does not disclose that the access control module is an access level control module, for defining a level of access to the resource for each user, or that the signing authority is used as an access mechanism for a resource to which the users wish to control access.

Brickell2, however, discloses an authenticator for authenticating each user according to authentication credentials (Column 2, line 65 to Column 3, line 15);

An access level control module, for defining a level of access to the resource for each user (Column 2, lines 29-34);

A resource interface, coupled to the access level control module for granting to a client operated by the second user access to the resource (Column 2, line 65 to Column 3, line 6); and

That the signing authority is used as an access mechanism for a resource to which the users wish to control access (Column 2, lines 1-34). This combination is the one in which the functionality of the CVS/CSP from Brickell2 is performed at the primary user's smart card. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the credential usage reporting of Brickell2 into the certification system of Sudia in order to provide a strict mechanism by which to control delegate access, as well as to provide detailed audit reports that can be used to verify unauthorized access.

Regarding Claim 51,

Sudia discloses in a client/server system for granting resource access to a second user in response to a message from a first user specifying that the second user be granted signing authority, a server comprising:

An access control module, for establishing a control relationship between the first user's authentication credential and the second user's authentication credential (Page 15, Paragraph 249); and

An interface, coupled to the access control module, for granting to a client operated by the second user access to the signing authority, by

providing to the resource the first user's authentication credential, wherein the first user's authentication credential is not provided to the second user (Page 15, Paragraph 250);

But does not disclose that the access control module is an access level control module, in which the control relationship allows the first user to control at least one parameter of the second user's level of access or that the signing authority is used as an access mechanism for a resource to which the users wish to control access.

Brickell2, however, discloses that the access control module is an access level control module (Column 2, line 65 to Column 3, line 6), in which the control relationship allows the first user to control at least one parameter of the second user's level of access (Column 2, lines 1-34);

A resource interface, coupled to the access level control module, for granting the second user access to the resource (Column 2, line 65 to Column 3, line 6); and

That the signing authority is used as an access mechanism for a resource to which the users wish to control access (Column 2, lines 1-34). This combination is the one in which the functionality of the CVS/CSP from Brickell2 is performed at the primary user's smart card. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the credential usage reporting of Brickell2 into the certification system of Sudia in order to provide a strict mechanism by

which to control delegate access, as well as to provide detailed audit reports that can be used to verify unauthorized access.

9. Claims 15, 25-29, 32, 33, and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sudia in view of Zhang, further in view of Brickell2.

Regarding Claim 15,

Sudia in view of Zhang does not disclose storing in an audit log information describing the second user's access to the resource and identifying the second user in connection with the access.

Brickell2, however, discloses storing in an audit log information describing the second user's access to the resource and identifying the second user in connection with the access (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the credential usage reporting of Brickell2 into the certification system of Sudia as modified by Zhang in order to provide a strict mechanism by which to control delegate access, as well as to provide detailed audit reports that can be used to verify unauthorized access.

Regarding Claim 25,

Sudia in view of Zhang does not disclose outputting, to the first user, notification of the second user's access to the resource.

Brickell2, however, discloses responsive to granting the second user access, outputting, to the first user, notification of the second user's access to the resource (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the credential usage reporting of Brickell2 into the certification system of Sudia as modified by Zhang in order to provide a strict mechanism by which to control delegate access, as well as to provide detailed audit reports that can be used to verify unauthorized access.

Regarding Claim 26,

Sudia as modified by Zhang does not disclose storing information describing the second user's access to the resource.

Brickell2, however, discloses responsive to granting the second user access, storing information describing the second user's access to the resource (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the credential usage reporting of Brickell2 into the certification system of Sudia as modified by Zhang in order to provide a strict mechanism by which to control delegate access, as well as to provide detailed audit reports that can be used to verify unauthorized access.

Regarding Claim 59,

Claim 59 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 26 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 27,

Sudia as modified by Zhang and Brickell2 discloses the method of claim 26, in addition, Brickell2 discloses that storing information comprises storing the information in an audit log (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 10).

Regarding Claim 28,

Sudia as modified by Zhang does not disclose storing information describing at least one subsequent interaction with the resource.

Brickell2, however, discloses storing information describing at least one subsequent interaction with the resource (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the credential usage reporting of Brickell2 into the certification system of Sudia as modified by Zhang in order to provide a strict mechanism by which to control delegate access, as well as to provide detailed audit reports that can be used to verify unauthorized access.

Regarding Claim 60,

Claim 60 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 28 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 29,

Sudia as modified by Zhang and Brickell2 discloses the method of claim 28, in addition, Brickell2 discloses that storing information comprises, for each interaction, storing information identifying which user accesses the resource (Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, line 10).

Regarding Claim 61,

Claim 61 is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 29 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 32,

Sudia as modified by Zhang does not disclose that the resource comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a data file, a data file stored in a server, an application, and data associated with the first user.

Brickell2, however, discloses that the resource comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a data file, a data file stored at a server, an application, and data associated with the first user (Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the credential usage reporting of Brickell2 into the certification system of Sudia as modified by Zhang in order to provide a strict mechanism by which to control delegate access, as well as to provide detailed audit reports that can be used to verify unauthorized access.

Regarding Claim 33,

Sudia as modified by Zhang do not disclose that the steps of the method are performed by a web-based application.

Brickell2, however, discloses that the steps of the method are performed by a web-based application (Column 2, lines 1-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the credential usage reporting of Brickell2 into the certification system of Sudia as modified by Zhang in order to provide a strict mechanism by which to control delegate access, as well as to provide detailed audit reports that can be used to verify unauthorized access.

10. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sudia in view of Zhang, further in view of Control-F1 (Control-F1, "Control-F1 Launches CF1Live 'Branded, Hosted, Rented' eSupport Solution", 7/6/2000, pp. 1, obtained from http://web.archive.org/web/20001121025300/http://www.control-f1.com/news/pr_cf1livelaunch.html).

Regarding Claim 4,

Sudia as modified by Zhang does not disclose that the account associated with the second user comprises a support representative account.

Control-F1, however, discloses that the account associated with the second user comprises a support representative account (Page 1). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the remotely controlled technical support system of Control-F1 into the certification system of Sudia as modified by Zhang in order to allow a support representative to diagnose and fix problems on a user's machine remotely, while the user can go about his normal work, thus increasing productivity and decreasing support costs.

Regarding Claim 9,

Sudia as modified by Zhang does not disclose that the group comprises support representatives.

Control-F1, however, discloses that the group comprises support representatives (Page 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the remotely controlled technical support system of Control-F1 into the certification system of Sudia as modified by Zhang in order to allow a support representative to diagnose and fix problems on a user's machine remotely, while the user can go about his normal work, thus increasing productivity and decreasing support costs.

11. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sudia in view of Zhang, further in view of Onishi (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0149667).

Regarding Claim 21,

Sudia in view of Zhang does not disclose terminating the second user's access to the resource after the second user has accessed the resource a predetermined number of times.

Onishi, however, discloses terminating the second user's access to the resource after the second user has accessed the resource a predetermined number of times (Page 2, Paragraphs 21 and 22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the usage counter of Onishi into the certification system of Sudia as modified by Zhang in order to allow for a pay-per-view type of system in which the second user must pay the first user for a preset number of accesses to the resource.

Regarding Claim 22,

Sudia as modified by Zhang and Onishi discloses the method of claim 21, in addition, Onishi disclose that the predetermined number of times is selectable by the first user (Page 2, Paragraphs 21 and 22).

12. Claims 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sudia in view of Brickell², further in view of Onishi.

Regarding Claim 41,

Sudia in view of Brickell² does not disclose that the resource interface further terminates the second user's access to the resource after

the second user has accessed the resource a predetermined number of times.

Onishi; however, discloses that the resource interface further terminates the second user's access to the resource after the second user has accessed the resource a predetermined number of times (Page 2, Paragraphs 21 and 22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the usage counter of Onishi into the certification system of Sudia as modified by Zhang in order to allow for a pay-per-view type of system in which the second user must pay the first user for a preset number of accesses to the resource.

Regarding Claim 42,

Sudia in view of Brickell2 and Onishi discloses the system of Claim 41, in addition, Onishi discloses that the predetermined number of times is selectable by the first user (Page 2, Paragraphs 21 and 22).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER